

### **REMARKS**

The current patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, dated September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2005, (hereinafter "the office action") in which: Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Ambler et al, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0133523 (hereinafter "Ambler") and claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ambler in view of Chou et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,583,761 (hereinafter "Chou"). Reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the following remarks and previous amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are amended. Claim 5 is cancelled. Claims 10-17 are added.

Assignee has amended claims 1-4 and 6-9 and added claims 10-17. The above amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Amendments to claims have been made to more clearly delineate intended subject matter. Assignee believes that none of these claim amendments constitute narrowing amendments. In fact, some of these claim amendments are intended to be broadening amendments. Accordingly, Assignee does not intend to surrender claimed subject matter by submission of the above amendments and no prosecution history estoppel should apply.

#### **Claim Rejections:**

The Examiner cited Ambler in rejecting each of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Assignee respectfully submits that Ambler does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. For example, Ambler at least does not disclose "locating a language string within the external language file." In Fig. 4, Ambler seems to show a method of generating a specific language string by identifying

language string parameters such as a text data type (Unicode or ASCII), font size, and font type [Ambler page 3, para. 38]. Therefore, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 1.

Assignee respectfully submits that claims 2-8 distinguish from Ambler on at least the same or similar basis. Thus, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw her rejections to claims 2-8. Assignee respectfully submits that the current claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambler in view of Chou.

Chou does not make up for the deficiencies of Ambler in meeting the limitations "searching a language string." Therefore, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 9.

It is believed that the foregoing arguments and amendments address the Examiner's concerns. Therefore, Assignee respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-9 on this ground be withdrawn.

It is noted that in the current application, claims 1-4 and 6-9 are currently amended, claim 5 is canceled and new claims 10-17 have been added. Support for the new claims is present throughout the specification for example, support for claim 10 can be found at page 3, paragraph 0017 and at page 4, paragraph 0018. No new matter has been added.

Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice. Assignee does not intend to surrender any subject matter by such cancellation. Accordingly, no prosecution history estoppel should apply. The assignee respectfully submits that claims 1-4 and 6-17 are in condition for allowance.

Any amounts due may be charged to deposit account number 50-3703.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in the current patent application as amended are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Reconsideration of the current patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michelle C Craig

Reg. No. 52,776

Dated: 12/22/05

c/o  
Berkeley Law and Technology Group  
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240  
Beaverton, OR 97006